

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
NASHVILLE DIVISION

BELINDA MARY GROOMS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. 3:21-cv-00363
	)	
v.	)	JUDGE RICHARDSON
	)	
WALDEN SECURITY, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**ORDER**

Pending before the Court is a Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (Doc. No. 69, “R&R”), wherein the Magistrate Judge recommends that Defendant Walden Security’s motions for sanctions (Doc. Nos. 65, 67) be granted in part and denied in part and that this Court dismiss the case with prejudice in accordance with Rules 37 and 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. No parties have filed an objection within 14 days as required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The failure to properly, specifically, and timely object to a report and recommendation releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. *Frias v. Frias*, No. 2:18-cv-00076, 2019 WL 549506, at \*2 (M.D. Tenn. Feb. 12, 2019). “The filing of vague, general, or conclusory objections does not meet the requirement of specific objections and is tantamount to a complete failure to object. Moreover, an objection that does nothing more than state a disagreement with a magistrate’s suggested resolution, or simply summarizes what has been presented before, is not an objection as that term is used in this context.” *Id.* at \*2 (internal citations and quotation marks omitted). The district court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any

other standard, those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made. *Ashraf v. Adventist Health System/Sunbelt, Inc.*, 322 F. Supp. 3d 879, 881 (W.D. Tenn. 2018); *Benson v. Walden Security*, No. 3:18-cv-0010, 2018 WL 6322332, at \*3 (M.D. Tenn. Dec. 4, 2018). The district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and rulings to which no specific objection is filed. *Id.*

Accordingly, the R&R (Doc. No. 69) is ADOPTED. Defendant Walden Security's motions for sanctions (Doc. Nos. 65, 67) are GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART. The case is DISMISSED with prejudice in accordance with Rules 37 and 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

This is the final order in this case. As it denies all relief, the Clerk SHALL enter judgment. Fed. R. Civ. P. 58(b)(1)(C).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

  
ELI RICHARDSON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE